UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,314	05/17/2005	David Wallach	WALLACH33	6672
	7590 09/29/200 D NEIMARK, P.L.L.C	EXAMINER		
624 NINTH ST		SWOPE, SHERIDAN		
SUITE 300 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20001-5303	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1652	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/511,314	WALLACH ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SHERIDAN SWOPE	1652		

	SHERIDAN SWOPE	1652	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 September 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examine Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	, on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
<ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bethe</li> <li>appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	•	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <u>69,70,75,82,83,85-88,90,91 and 102</u> Claim(s) rejected: <u>69, 70, 75, 82, 83, 85-88, 90, 91, and 1</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>20,25,72,84 and 8</u>	<u>102-105</u> .		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/SHERIDAN SWOPE/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1652	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

No claim amendments have been filed.

Regarding Applicants' remarks, the following comments are made.

Regarding rejection under 35 USC 112/enablement:

- (A) Applicants argue that the Office has misrepresented the binding of SEQ ID NO: 18 to full-length cgc; +/- means weak binding. It is acknowled that +/- means weak binding.
- (B) The specification shows the binding of a NIK c-terminus peptide (NIK624-947) (SEQ ID NO: 19) has '++++' binding with full-length common gamma chain and SEQ ID NO: 19 comprises SEQ ID NO: 18.

Demonstration that a protein has binding activity does not allow the skilled artisan to deduce that, more likely than not, a fragment of said protein has the same binding activity.

(C) Figure 5, clearly shows that the NIK c-terminus (comprising SEQ ID NO: 18) inhibits common gamma chain induced enhancement of NIK function.

Demonstration that a protein inhibits an enzymatic activity does not allow the skilled artisan to deduce that, more likely than not, a fragment of said protein inhibits a binding activity.

- (D) SEQID NO: 18 is actually the minimal common gamma chain binding region in NIK that was identified by deletion analysis.

  Demonstration that deletion of a peptide region in a protein alters the protein's function is not sufficient to convince the skilled artisan that, more likely than not not, said peptide alone has the desired function.
- (E) Modulation of NIK-common gamma chain pathway is relevant for only those diseases which involve defects in NF-KB activation induced by specific interleukins.

The claims are not limited to diseases which involve defects in NF-KB activation induced by specific interleukins.

(F) It is presumed that the previous response overcame the part of the rejection with respect to the scope of the polypeptide to be administered.

The skilled artisan would be enabled for making the genus of polypeptides that are (i) a fragment of SEQ ID NO: 18 or (ii) all variants of SEQ ID NO: 18 having at least 90% identity. The type and function of the derivatization encompassed is not recited.

Regarding rejection under 35 USC 112/written descripiton:

Applicants provide the same arguments set forth above (A)-(F).